

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

SANA MUJAHID, on behalf of herself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWITY, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-08012

Judge: Hon. Jorge L. Alonso

**DEFENDANT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO
ANSWER, MOVE, OR OTHERWISE RESPOND**

(EXPEDITED RULING REQUESTED)

Defendant NEWITY LLC (“Defendant”) hereby respectfully submits this **unopposed** motion for an extension of time to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint in this matter, to an including **September 8, 2025** (or however long the Court deems appropriate), and respectfully seeks an expedited ruling on same.¹ In support thereof, Defendant states as follows:

1. This matter is a putative class action alleging claims pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. §§ 227, *et seq.*

2. Plaintiff filed her Complaint in this action on July 15, 2025. *See* Dkt. 1.

¹ In seeking this extension, Defendant reserves all rights including, but not limited to, the right to compel arbitration and to assert the defenses of lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, lack of personal jurisdiction, improper venue, insufficient process, insufficient service of process, lack of standing, failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and any other defenses to the purported claims alleged in Plaintiff’s Complaint. Nothing in this Motion should be construed as a waiver of any of Defendant’s rights, arguments, or objections, including its arbitral rights to the extent there is an applicable arbitration agreement between the parties (which is to be determined).

3. Defendant was purportedly served with process on July 17, 2025. *See* Dkt. 4. As such, Defendant's *current* deadline to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint is presently August 7, 2025.

4. Since being served, Defendant worked diligently to find, interview, and retain experienced TCPA class action litigation defense counsel (Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP, who will be appearing forthwith), to handle the litigation and act as lead defense counsel in the matter. This process took considerable time, and Defendant was not able to locate and retain litigation counsel before the responsive pleading deadline. As that retention is not yet finalized, the undersigned counsel is filing this extension on Defendant's behalf.

5. On August 7, 2025, counsel for Defendant conferred with counsel for Plaintiff, Anthony Paronich, via email regarding an extension of thirty (30) days with respect to Defendant's aforementioned responsive pleading deadline, who confirmed in writing the same that Plaintiff agrees to the requested extension.

6. There are several reasons as to why Defendant and its new counsel seek and are in need of an additional extension of time as to Defendant's pleading deadline. **First**, Defendant just retained new litigation counsel (Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP, who will be appearing once their retention is finalized), who have experience with defending TCPA matters, and was unable to do so until today. **Second**, Defendant's new litigation counsel need sufficient additional time to finalize their retention, appear in the matter, adequately investigate the underlying facts and allegations in the Complaint, prepare an appropriate responsive pleading(s), and potentially explore an extra-judicial resolution of this dispute with Plaintiff and opposing counsel, which may obviate the need for Defendant to respond to the Complaint altogether if successful. **Third**, Defendant's new counsel have several unmovable professional and personal scheduling conflicts

with the current deadline (including briefs due in other matters and out-of-town travel), which make completing the foregoing tasks by the current deadline extraordinarily difficult. **Fourth**, the modest requested extension will promote efficiency and conserve judicial and party resources, by allowing Defendant sufficient time to investigate the claims and attempt to reach an extra-judicial resolution without having to engage in motion practice. **Fifth**, Defendant has worked diligently since being served to locate and retain experienced TCPA litigation counsel, as well as to investigate Plaintiff's allegations, but requires additional time before they can respond to the Complaint.

7. In light of these issues, Defendant seeks a modest extension of its current responsive pleading deadline, as well as an expedited ruling on this Motion given the current deadline.

8. Pursuant to the requested and agreed to extension, if granted, and by operation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6 (a)(1)(C), Defendant's new deadline to answer, move or otherwise respond to the Complaint would be on or before Monday, September 8, 2025.²

9. This is Defendant's first request for an extension.

10. No other case deadlines will be impacted by the requested extension.

11. This motion is made in good faith and not for the purpose of delay. At all relevant times, Defendant has acted diligently in meeting the current deadline. No party to this action will be unduly prejudiced by the granting of the requested extension of time, especially as the parties are in agreement. An extension will not impact the timely resolution of this matter, or any other deadlines, as this case is in its early stages.

² Thirty days from the current deadline is September 6, 2025, which is a Saturday. By operation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6 (a)(1)(C), the deadline rolls to the next business day, September 8, 2025.

12. Thus, Defendant respectfully submits that there is sufficient “good cause” to grant the requested extension, for at least the reasons provided above.

WHEREFORE, for all of the reasons above, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court enter an order extending its deadline to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint to and including September 8, 2025. A proposed order has been included as **Exhibit A** for the Court’s consideration.

Dated: August 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

NEWITY LLC

By: /s/ Joshua J. Cauhorn

One of Its Attorneys

Joshua J. Cauhorn (jcauhorn@burkelaw.com)
BURKE, WARREN, MACKAY & SERRITELLA,
P.C.
330 North Wabash Avenue, 21st Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60611
T: 312-840-7000
F: 312-840-9000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on August 7, 2025, the foregoing **Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Complaint** was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent to all parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's electronic docket.

/s/ Joshua J. Cauhorn

EXHIBIT

A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

SANA MUJAHID, on behalf of herself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEWITY, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-08012

Judge: Hon. Jorge L. Alonso

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION
OF TIME TO ANSWER, MOVE, OR OTHERWISE RESPOND**

This matter, coming to be heard on “Defendant’s Unopposed Motion for an Extension of Time to Answer, Move, or Otherwise Respond to Complaint” (hereafter, the “Motion”) filed on August 7, 2025 in this matter, due notice having been given, the Court being fully apprised in the premises, the Motion being unopposed, and for good cause shown, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:** (a) the Motion is **GRANTED** for the reasons stated therein; and (2) Defendant shall have until **September 8, 2025** to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint (*see* Dkt. 1).

SO ORDERED THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2025,

By:_____

Hon. Jorge L. Alonso

United States District Judge